



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,593	12/13/2005	Takeshi Azami	8074-1106	7258
466	7590	04/30/2009	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON			GREGORIO, GUINEVER S	
209 Madison Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 500			1793	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MAIL DATE	
			04/30/2009	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/560,593  <b>Examiner</b> GUINEVER S. GREGORIO	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AZAMI ET AL.  <b>Art Unit</b> 1793
---	---	--

*–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –*

THE REPLY FILED 26 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: See Continuation Sheet

/Melvin Curtis Mayes/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/GUINEVER S GREGORIO/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the apparatus taught by the primary, Suzuki et al., with the protective pipe taught by Yukishige et al., one of the secondary references cited. However, the argument does not address the rejection as a whole. The rejection laid out by Examiner was Suzuki et al. in view of Yukishige et al. and Iijima et al. Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified the apparatus taught by Suzuki et al. with the protective pipe taught by Yukishige et al. because Suzuki et al. teaches making quantum dots from silicon which does not produce soot and therefore would not develop a problem with soot build up on the entry window for the laser beam. However, Examiner cited Iijima et al. because Iijima et al. teaches a method of making carbon nano-horns using a laser apparatus and graphite target. Examiner took the position that one of ordinary skill in the art would have used the apparatus taught by Suzuki et al. which is generally for use in making ultra small particles, for the method taught by Iijima et al. and that an artisan in the art would recognize the problem of vapor deposition (soot build up) as taught by Yukishige et al. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have known that where the apparatus of Suzuki is used with a graphite target for irradiated with a light source to produce nanosize horns, to solve the problem with soot build up, there is needed a protective pipe between the graphite target and the window where the light source enters as taught by Yukishige et al.

Continuation of 13. Other: The terminal disclaimer filed on 04/23/09 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of Application Number 10/544,400 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded..